

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks.

In this reply, Applicant amends claims 1 and 12; and adds claims 20 and 21. Claims 1-21 are thus currently pending. The changes and additions to the claims find non-limiting support in the originally-filed application, for example from page 20, line 1, to page 24, line 9, and in Figs. 3-8. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0136563, "Maeda"); and claims 4-6, 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, and 15-19 as being anticipated by Maeda, and to the rejection of claims 4-6, 11, 13, and 14 as being unpatentable over Maeda, and in the spirit of moving prosecution forward, Applicant amends claims 1 and 12 as set forth below. Applicant, however, reserves the right to present original claims 1 and 12 in a continuation application and to address any related issues in the continuation.

Applicant amends independent claim 1 to recite that "the setting screen includes an OK button for enabling the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen" and that "the inputted setting of the image forming condition is enabled and a short cut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set is displayed on the initial screen when there is an input to operate the OK button."

Along the same lines, Applicant amends independent claim 12 to recite “receiving an input to operate an OK button so as to enable the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen” and “enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and displaying a short cut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set on the initial screen when the input to operate the OK button is received.”

Maeda discloses a basic screen provided with shortcut keys 17, 18, and 19 (see, e.g., Fig. 8) to which “[i]t is possible to allocate desired functions selected from the 22 functions that the copier 1 has” (see paragraph 64) using the selection procedure illustrated in Figs. 9-11. However, Applicant submits that Maeda’s basic screen and Maeda’s other screens, including function list screens 12A and 12B illustrated in Figs. 4A and 4B, which lists Maeda’s 22 functions, do not teach or suggest “an OK button for enabling the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen,” as recited in amended independent claim 1, and do not teach or suggest “receiving an input to operate an OK button so as to enable the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen,” as recited in amended independent claim 12.

Applicant further submits that Maeda’s shortcut keys 17, 18, and 19 are not displayed “when there is an input to operate the OK button” since Maeda does not teach the claimed OK button. Moreover, none of Maeda’s 22 functions that can be assigned to shortcut keys 17, 18, and 19 teaches or suggests “redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set.” For at least these reasons, Maeda thus also fails to teach or suggest that “the inputted setting of the image forming condition is enabled and a short cut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image

forming condition was set is displayed on the initial screen when there is an input to operate the OK button,” as recited in amended independent claim 1, and “enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and displaying a short cut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set on the initial screen when the input to operate the OK button is received,” as recited in amended independent claim 12.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Maeda fails to teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claims 1 and 12, and thus that none of claims 1 and 12, nor any of their dependent claims, are anticipated by or unpatentable over Maeda. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, and 15-19 as being anticipated by Maeda, and of the rejection of claims 4-6, 11, 13, and 14 as being unpatentable over Maeda.

Finally, Applicant adds new claims 20 and 21 to vary the scope of protection recited in the claims. Claims 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively, and are thus believed to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1 and 12.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and background art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Accordingly, Applicant declines to subscribe to any such characterizations unless expressly set forth in this reply.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 18, 2007

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220